

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Alfrest COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Vigonia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gev

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456 105	12/06/1999	David L. Hecht	07447.0043-0	5989

7590

05 21 2003

DANIEL B. CURTIS
PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER
XEROX CORPORATION
100 CLINTON AVE. S., XEROX SQ. 20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER
FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A souli and an Mar	Applicant(s)			
• .	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	Office Action Comments	09/456,105	HECHT ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jamara A. Franklin	2876			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE - External after of the control	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron e, cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communicat ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ion.		
Status						
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 151					
2a)	•—	nis action is non-final.				
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under ion of Claims			s is		
_	Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application	1				
,,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw					
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
_	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers	•				
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	pted or b) objected to by the Exa	aminer.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)	oved by the Examiner.			
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re-	ply to this Office action.				
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority I	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).			
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
* (3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Busee the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_			
14) 🗌 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional applica	ation).		
	The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest					
Attachmen		. , 55				
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> .	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)	-· 		
T has toot 2	rodomari. Office					

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made of the receipt of the amendment filed on 5/15/03. Claims 1-17 are currently pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/15/03 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Newly amended claims 1 and 2 cite an apparatus and a method "displaying the second image information and the first image information". The examiner notes that the specifications indicate that the first image information can be seen "through semitransparent mirror 402 overlaid with the overlay image information generated by image generator 394" (page 14, line

Application/Control Number: 09/456,105

Art Unit: 2876

17-page 15, line 2). The examiner can find no evidence supporting the claim that the first image information is "displayed" by the lens apparatus 328.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cone (US 4,766,292) in view of Daniele (US 5,444,779).

Cone teaches reading a UPC label on a merchandise item thereby generating data identifying the merchandise item (registration information). This data is transmitted to a processing unit 94 which has stored therein lookup tables for use in retrieving the price of the purchased item (second storage information) utilizing the data generated by a scanner 90 in scanning the UPC label. The processing unit 94 will enable a display member 96 to display the price of the merchandise item (col. 3, lines 55-62).

Cone lacks the teaching of embedded glyph data.

Daniele teaches a glyph code within regions 150 or 152 of a document (col. 7, lines 22-24).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that glyph codes have a non-obtrusive appearance that may be more appealing to the eye than a typical UPC code on a

Application/Control Number: 09/456,105

Art Unit: 2876

product. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Cone with the glyph code as taught by Daniele for aesthetic reasons.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 5/15/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Cone and Daniele references are relied upon to maintain the rejection of claims 1 and 2. Contrary to the argument that Cone does not teach retrieving a second image information, the examiner submits that Cone does teach this by retrieving the price of the merchandise from a lookup table. The price of the merchandise is considered 'second image information'. This 'second image information' is then displayed on a display member.

In response to the argument that Cone does not teach or suggest displaying the second image information and the first image information, the examiner can find no evidence to support the newly added limitation in claims 1 and 2.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to replace the bar code of Cone with the glyph code of Daniele.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is 703-305-0128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Jamara A. Franklin

Examiner
Art Unit 2876

JAF May 18, 2003

MHCHARL G LEE

UPÉRWASORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800